

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations
and is not a part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

**As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,
please do not report the images to the
Image Problem Mailbox.**

REMARKS

Entry of Substitute Specification:

The applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of entry of the substitute specification previously submitted. In the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that there was no statement that the substitute specification contains no new matter. The applicant respectfully submits, however, that the applicant specifically indicated, "The amendments provided herein do not add any new subject matter as they simply add a Cross-Reference section at the beginning of the specification." (See Page 2 of the Preliminary Amendment). As such, the applicant reiterates that the substitute specification contains no new matter. Be that as it may, the importance of the substitute specification was to merely insert the cross-reference to the related application. As such, the applicant has simply provided the desired amendment to the specification herein. No new matter is presented in the proposed amendment and entry herein is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102(b):

The Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 8-10, 12-13, 21 and 23 in view of Bindon et al., claims 21 and 23 in view of Bindon and claims 1-2, 8-10 and 12-13 in view of Simo et al. The applicant has cancelled without prejudice pending claims 1-2, 8-10, 12-13, 21 and 23 and submitted new claims 31-50. The new claims do not add any new subject matter and entry is therefore respectfully requested. The applicant also submits that the new claims overcome each of the rejections set forth by the Examiner, with reasons for allowability of each of the now pending claims set forth below.

With respect to claim 32, Bindon et al. does not teach a "pin guard configured for coupling to a bow with at least one mounting member." Further more, Bindon et al. fails to teach at least one sight pin coupled to the pin guard and an elongate fiber optic member attached to the at least one sight pin with the fiber optic member having a first end forming a sight indicia. The Examiner has indicated the sight pin in Bindon et al. as element 26, 30. As shown in Figs. 2A-5 and described in the specification of Bindon et al., "An aiming or sighting post 26, made of a fiber optic material, is located in the Focal Plane B and has its terminal end 28 substantial at the focal point 30." (column 5, lines 31-34) Accordingly, the applicant respectfully submits that Bindon et al. fails to teach "an elongate fiber optic member attached to said at least one sight pin having a first end and a second end, said first end supported by said at least one sight pin proximate said first end." Indeed, the fiber optic member forming the sight indicia is unsupported proximate the distal end.

Simo et al. fails to teach a "non-electric, luminescent member." The pin block disk 141 of Simo et al. is not luminescent and requires an external light source for illumination. As stated in the specification, "As shown in FIG. 9, the transparent pin block disk 141 is slidably positioned in the pin slide 39. The pin block disk 141 effectively collects surrounding light and directs it to the light-emitting pin 123." Accordingly, Simo et al. fails to teach each of the claim elements.

With respect to claim 32, the applicant respectfully submits that the "non-electric, light-emitting member" of Bindon et al. is not "selectively positionable to register against

said fiber optic member.” The applicant is unable to locate any such teaching in Bindon et al.

The applicant respectfully submits that neither Bindon et al. nor Simo et al. teach or suggest “the channel at least partially exposed to ambient light”, with the “elongate fiber optic member disposed over said luminescent member, extending around a portion of said exterior surface and at least partially disposed within said channel,” as set forth in claim 33. As discussed in Bindon et al., “The tritium lamp 32 is located in one of the slots 55 in the mounting ring 35 and at a position behind the opaque lower cover section 43. In this way the tritium lamp 32 is essentially blocked from emanating stray light into the interior of the scope or outwardly from the scope 10.” Thus, Bindon et al. specifically teaches away from an “exposed channel” as recited in the claim.

The applicant respectfully submits that the prior art fails to teach an elongate segment of tape to illuminate the fiber optic member as recited in claim 34.

The applicant respectfully submits that none of the prior art teaches that the fiber optic member extends from the first end to the channel as stated in claim 35. Indeed, the fiber optic member of Bindon et al. forming the sight tip is not the same fiber optic member that forms the fiber optic collector 49. Bindon et al. states, “The fiber optic collector 49 is optically connected to a separate fiber optic transmission line 60 which can be coupled therewith by way of a standard fiber optic coupling 61.” (column 11, lines 62-65). As such, claim 35 should be allowable over the prior art.

The applicant respectfully submits that neither Bindon et al. nor Simo et al. teach that the “luminescent member is positioned adjacent a substantial portion of the length of

said fiber optic member,” as recited in claim 36. Indeed, Bindon et al. discloses a tritium lamp 32 which by its very nature is more of a point source of light that would illuminate a discrete portion of the fiber optic member. As such, claim 36 should be allowable over the prior art.

With respect to claim 37, the applicant submits that no such teaching is shown in the prior art.

With respect to claim 38, neither Bindon et al. nor Bindon teach a pin arm “configured for attaching to the bow sight.” Indeed, Bindon et al. and Bindon each teach optical sighting devices for a rifle (see Fig. 1 of Bindon). Furthermore, neither Bindon et al. nor Bindon teach that the pin arm supports “said fiber optic member proximate said sight tip so that the pin arm extends in a direction substantially perpendicular to the first end of the fiber optic member when viewing a front side of said pin arm.” As shown in Figs. 2A-5 and described in the specification of Bindon et al., “An aiming or sighting post 26, made of a fiber optic material, is located in the Focal Plane B and has its terminal end 28 substantial at the focal point 30.” (column 5, lines 31-34) There is no such support. In Bindon, the supporting ring 44 does not meet the structural elements recited in the claim. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully submits that Bindon et al. and Bindon fail to teach the elements of the claim. Thus, claim 38 should be allowable.

Simo et al. fails to teach a “non-electric, luminescent member.” The pin block disk 141 of Simo et al. is not luminescent and requires an external light source for illumination. As stated in the specification, “As shown in FIG. 9, the transparent pin block

7

disk 141 is slidably positioned in the pin slide 39. The pin block disk 141 effectively collects surrounding light and directs it to the light-emitting pin 123." Accordingly, Simo et al. fails to teach each of the claim elements.

The applicant respectfully submits that the "non-electric, light-emitting member" of Bindon et al. is not "selectively positionable to register against said fiber optic member," as provided in claim 39. The applicant is unable to locate any such teaching in Bindon et al.

With respect to claim 40, the applicant respectfully submits that neither Bindon et al. nor Simo et al. teach or suggest "the channel at least partially exposed to ambient light", with the "elongate fiber optic member disposed over said luminescent member, extending around a portion of said exterior surface and at least partially disposed within said channel." As discussed in Bindon et al., "The tritium lamp 32 is located in one of the slots 55 in the mounting ring 35 and at a position behind the opaque lower cover section 43. In this way the tritium lamp 32 is essentially blocked from emanating stray light into the interior of the scope or outwardly from the scope 10." Thus, Bindon et al. specifically teaches away from an "exposed channel" as recited in the claim.

With respect to claim 41, the applicant respectfully submits that the prior art fails to teach an elongate segment of tape to illuminate the fiber optic member.

With respect to claim 42, the applicant respectfully submits that none of the prior art teaches that the fiber optic member extends from the first end to the channel.

Indeed, the fiber optic member of Bindon et al. forming the sight tip is not the same fiber

optic member that forms the fiber optic collector 49. Bindon et al. states, "The fiber optic collector 49 is optically connect d to a separate fiber optic transmission line 60 which can be coupled therewith by way of a standard fiber optic coupling 61." (column 11, lines 62-65). As such, claim 42 should be allowable over the prior art.

With respect to claim 43, the applicant respectfully submits that neither Bindon et al. nor Simo et al. teach that the "luminescent member is positioned adjacent a substantial portion fo the length of said fiber optic member." Indeed, Bindon et al. discloses a tritium lamp 32 which by its very nature is more of a point source of light that would illuminate a discrete portion of the fiber optic member. As such, claim 43 should be allowable over the prior art.

With respect to claim 44, the applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching in the cited prior art of the pin arm being "configured for mounting as a pendulum sight pin."

With respect to claim 45, the applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching in the cited prior art of the luminescent member being "disposed over a portion of a length of said fiber optic member."

With respect to claim 46, the applicant submits that the prior art fails to teach or suggest "an elongate fiber optic member attached to said at least one sight pin having a first end and a second end, said first end supported by said at least one sight pin proximate said first end, said first end forming a sight indicia when viewing a front side of said at least one sight pin, and said elongate fiber optic member disposed at least

partially within said channel for light gathering when the pin guard is exposed to light.”
As such claim 46 should be allowable over the prior art.

With respect to claim 47, the applicant respectfully submits that the prior art fails to teach or suggest a luminescent member disposed within the channel, where the channel is at least partially exposed to ambient light. Thus, claim 47 should also be in condition for allowance.

With respect to claim 48, the applicant submits that the prior art fails to teach that the fiber optic member extends around the pin guard in the channel. As such, claim 48 is in condition for allowance.

The applicant respectfully submits that the prior art fails to teach an elongate segment of tape to illuminate the fiber optic member as recited in claim 48.

The applicant respectfully submits that none of the prior art teaches that the fiber optic member extends from the first end to the channel as recited in claim 50. Indeed, the fiber optic member of Bindon et al. forming the sight tip is not the same fiber optic member that forms the fiber optic collector 49. Bindon et al. states, “The fiber optic collector 49 is optically connected to a separate fiber optic transmission line 60 which can be coupled therewith by way of a standard fiber optic coupling 61.” (column 11, lines 62-65). As such, claim 35 should be allowable over the prior art.

The applicant respectfully submits that neither Bindon et al. nor Simo et al. teach that the “luminescent member is positioned adjacent a substantial portion of the length of said fiber optic member” as stated in claim 51. Indeed, Bindon et al. discloses a tritium lamp 32 which by its very nature is more of a point source of light that would illuminate a

discrete portion of the fiber optic member. As such, claim 36 should be allowable over the prior art.

CONCLUSION

The Examiner is welcome to call the attorney of record, Frank W. Compagni, at (801) 478-0071 if further discussion of this matter is warranted. Should any other additional adverse action be necessary on the application, the Examiner is also welcome to contact Mr. Compagni so that such matters may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully Submitted,



Frank W. Compagni
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 40,567
MORRISS, BATEMAN, O'BRYANT & COMPAGNI, P.C.
136 South Main Street, Suite 700
Salt Lake City, Utah 84101
(801) 478-0071 telephone
(801) 478-0076 facsimile